

REMARKS

Claims 13-26, 38-51, 63-76, 88-120 and 123-128 are pending in this case, of which claims 1-12, 27-37, 52-62, 77-87, 121 and 122, are canceled. Claims 13, 38, and 63 are amended herein. Claims 17-26 are pending and are not included in the Office Action Summary Disposition of Claims listed by Examiner. Applicant feels this is an inadvertent error and believes that claims 17-26, are pending in this case.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 13-26, 38-51, 63-76, 88-114, 120 and 128 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodin *et al.* (Patent No.: US 6,604,106 B1 filed December 10, 1998), in view of Bjork *et al.* Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Regarding the rejection to claims 13, 38, and 63, and all claims dependent therefrom, the Office Action attributed the first element of "sending" to Bodin, and the remainder of the claim limitations to Bjork. The combination does not teach applicant's claims as amended herein. The amendments herein were solely made for the purposes of expediting this application.

Bjork, and thus the combination teaches a device which displays a plurality of thumbnails, which represent respective webpages. The Office Action attributed the thumbnails to a first portion with regards to applicant's claims. Bjork teaches that the thumbnails are selectable which brings them to the center of the display in a larger view, while the plurality of thumbnails are concurrently displayed. The Office Action attributed the larger image as the second portion with regard to applicant's claims.

Applicant's amended claims require the first portion to be 1.) uncompressed and 2.) cover a substantial viewing area of the display. Bjork does not teach these claim limitations. Applicant also notes that Bjork does not teach that two portions of the same

image; Bjork teaches two images, of which one is a thumbnail of another, and therefore they do not represent two portions of one image. For this reason alone the rejection was improper.

Applicant believes amended claims 13, 38, and 63, and all claims dependent therefrom, have overcome the rejection. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

With regards to the rejection to independent claims 88, 97, and 106, and all claims dependent therefrom, the Office Action stated that it is commonly known in the art that web pages change over time. The applicant hereby challenges that assumption and requests that the Examiner appropriately cite this claim element. It is well known that a proper case of obviousness needs to include all the claim elements.

The Office Action also stated that refreshing an image only in response to a user input is well known in the art. Again, the applicant is due a fair analysis of the pending claims, thus the assumption is challenged and applicant requests that the Examiner appropriately cite this claim element.

Furthermore, Bjork states that the proxy server transforms HTML pages in real time, see page 188, right col., first bullet point. Thus applicant believes that Bjork teaches away from the combination because the mention of real time processing suggests that the server is transmitting HTML documents to the device. Accordingly applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

With regards to independent claims 93, 102, and 114, and all claims dependent therefrom, the Office Action stated that Bjork, and thus the combination, teaches rendering an image, the image being rendered at the remote server from the entire document. Bjork does not teach rendering an image from the entire documents. Bjork teaches a proxy server which chunks pages into smaller pages, reduces text, and extracts

links, see page 188, right col., bullets 3-5. These operations are not the same as rendering an image from the entire document. For this reason alone, the combination fails to anticipate applicant's claims. Based on this, applicant also submits that Bjork fails to teach any other claim element regarding the image.

Furthermore, there is no support for Bjork teaching sending a message to determine if the selection is on a link in the document. From above it shows that the proxy sends extracted links to the device, so it would be illogical to double check the selection of a pre-positively identified extracted link. Applicant notes that Bjork does not mention any proxy server interaction when clicking on a link on the device, and specifically teaches that the device simply will follow the link when clicked, see page 192, left col., item #10. Therefore the combination also fails to teach this claim element, accordingly applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 115-117, 123 and 125 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodin in view of Bjork further in view of Caruso et al. (Patent No.: US 7,113,638, filed January 27, 2000. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As shown above, the base combination is improper with respect to the base claims, to which the addition of Caruso does not remedy. Therefore applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 118, 119, 14, 126 and 127 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodin and Bjork in view of Caruso further in view of Kurzweil et al. patent No. US 6,587,583, filed September 17, 1999. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As shown above, the base combination is improper with respect to the base claims, to which the addition of Caruso and Kurzweil does not remedy. Therefore applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.


Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the arguments and amendments set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time to respond, and a check for the extension fee is enclosed. Please charge deposit account 02-2666 for any shortage in fees associated with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: Dec. 10, 2007



James C. Scheller, Jr.
Reg. No. 31,195

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
(408) 720-8300